

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 8-12 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 8-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerpheide et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,680,731) in view of Gerpheide (U.S. Patent No. 5,861,875). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding, in order to expedite prosecution of the present application, Applicant has elected to amend independent Claim 1 in order to more fully distinguish the present application. Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite an input device that includes, inter alia, "lead wiring of the X electrodes and the Y electrodes bundled in the extension section and connected to the non-flexible circuit substrate, wherein the Y electrodes are connected to the lead wiring via a through-hole part provided on the insulating layer." Independent Claim 8 has been amended to incorporate similar features as independent Claim 1. At a minimum, the proposed combination does not teach these elements.

The Examiner primarily relies on '731 Patent. In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the combination of the PC board 82 and the curved plastic sheets 84 depicted in Figure 10A of the '731 Patent discloses the extension section as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant respectfully submits that the '731 Patent fails to teach or suggest an input device that includes "lead wiring of

the X electrodes and the Y electrodes bundled in the extension section and connected to the non-flexible circuit substrate, wherein the Y electrodes are connected to the lead wiring via a through-hole part provided on the insulating layer.” The ‘731 Patent simply notes that that “[t]he touchpad sensing electrode are disposed on bent or curved plastic sheets 84 to the PC board 82 which is aligned so as to be disposed underneath the plastic sheets 80 of the touch-sensitive surface. The plastic sheets 80 can be attached the underside of a keyboard case or a standalone touchpad case, while the PC board is disposed directly underneath.” Applicant respectfully contends that the ‘731 Patent lacks any mention of an extension section as discussed above.

The ‘875 Patent fails to remedy the shortcomings of the ‘731 Patent. As noted in the Office Action, the Examiner merely relies on the ‘875 Patent for the proposition of utilizing touch sensors (Office Action, Paragraph 3). The ‘875 Patent is completely silent with regards to the configuration of the extension section. Specifically, the ‘875 Patent fails to disclose or suggest “lead wiring of the X electrodes and the Y electrodes bundled in the extension section and connected to the non-flexible circuit substrate, wherein the Y electrodes are connected to the lead wiring via a through-hole part provided on the insulating layer.” Applicant also submits that a number of the Examiner’s other assertions regarding the combination of the ‘731 Patent and the ‘875 Patent are incorrect. However these issues are moot given the preceding discussion.

Thus, Applicant believes independent Claim 1 patentability distinguishes over the prior art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent Claims 1 and 8 are patentably distinct from the combination of references proposed by the Examiner. As

such, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections against independent Claims 1 and 8 and their respective dependent claims be removed.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200